

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/549,873		JANOWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	STUART S. BRAY		3733	

All Participants:

(1) STUART S. BRAY.

(2) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 July 2011

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 21, 30

Prior art documents discussed:

Yuan

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/STUART S BRAY/
Examiner, Art Unit 3733

Status of Application: RCE

(3) Steven Favakeh.

(4) _____.

Time: 10:30am

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner and Attorney Favakeh discussed the amended claims in the application, specifically the addition of the location of the camming surface on the cam lock. Mr. Favakeh explained that the cam lock does not translate vertically when rotated to cam the rod; this is distinguishing over the Yuan design, which has camming surfaces on the flanges and translates vertically when rotated.